

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virgiria 22313-1450 www.uspoj.cov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/448,804	11/24/1999	DAVID L. SALGADO	D/99253-690	5473
2512 7590 03/08/2010 Perman & Green, LLP		EXAMINER		
99 Hawley Lane			PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R	
Stratford, CT 06614			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/08/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/448,804	SALGADO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sathyanarayan Pannala	2164	

/Sathyanarayan Pannala/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164

13. Other: _____.

а

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant filed on 2/24/2010 amendment after Final Office Action by amending claims 1 and 3 to overcome claims objection. The amendment will be entered and the claims objection is withdrawn

Applicant's argument regarding claims 1 and 2 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) stated as "there is absolutely on disclosure of computer readable medium there or anywhere in Fujiwara." In response to Applicant argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because Fujiwara do teach in Fig. 2 and 3 as element 240 as Non-volatile memory and further detailed-out in the Fig. 3 as the software components of the computer readable memory.

Further, Applicant argued regarding claim 1 rejection using the prior art Fujiwara as "there is no disclosure of a system manager or a platform controller." Again, in response to Applicant argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because Frivaria do teach as "computer software programs fying locally include a series of instructions that control operation and functionality of computer system", which is the same as the claim and the specification of the current invention (see 20.1. Inlies 20.2-23).

Further, Applicant argued as "there is no disclosure since possess is not the same as collect." Again, in response to Applicant argument, Examiner respectfully diagrees for equating wrong words. Applicant is requested to interpret properly. Examiner considered as "selecting attributes" for Collecting attributes ".

Applicant's argument regarding claims 3 and 12 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) stated as "Teare does disclose 'polling' that is not the same as 'collecting'." Again, in response to Applicant argument, Examiner thanks applicant for agreeing that the prior art do teach the claimed subject matter. Whenever applicant tries to misuse well known words, and not defined properly, Examiner will have the opportunity to use broadest and reasonable interpretation as per MPEP.

Therefore, Examiner rejection of claims in the final Office Action is maintained.